UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/975,250	10/12/2001	Takuhito Ueno	110863	8843	
25944 OLIFF & BER	7590 08/20/2007 RIDGE, PLC		EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 19928			RUDOLPH, VINCENT M		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2625		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/20/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/975,250	UENO ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Vincent M. Rudolph	2625		

	Vincent M. Rudolph	2625					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 01 August 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as				
NOTICE OF APPEAL	oliones with 07 OFD 44 07 word by	61. 4 20.2 4					
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complising the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed. 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since				
AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re		the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.116		mpliant Amandment	(DTOL 224)				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		mphant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	llowable if submitted in a separate,	·	ū				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ wi vided below or appended.	II be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>16-25</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affiday	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	hed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet.							

Continuation of 13. Applicant argues that the combined prior art of Kim and Guillemin does not teach that a controller is an off-mode during a power save mode. Guillemin discloses that a media handling device, which includes a processor (See Col. 3, Line 7-8), is in an off-state in the power save mode, such as in a lower power state that includes an off mode (See Col. 1, Line 37-39), and then shifted to a higher power state in order to carry out the selected mode for a device (See Col. 3, Line 37-58). Thus, by combining this with the teaching of Kim, it allows to maximize the power saving capability of the device. As a result, the combined prior art is able to meet the limitations of the claims.

The applicant also argues that the combined prior art of Kim, Garcia, and Kawase does not disclose controlling the speed for receiving data during the transition period from the power save mode to the normal mode. Garcia discloses adjusting the transfer rate for receiving data (See Col. 3, Line 61-Col. 4, Line 5), but does not disclose doing this during a transition period from the power save mode to the normal mode. Kawase, on the other hamd disclose a transition period from the power-save mode to the normal mode (See Figure 2; Col. 8, Line 59-64). Thus, by combining these together, it is able to conserve power consumption but still allow a sufficient amount of time for the printer to reach a certain level in order to output the image data as well as controlling the transfer speed in order to avoid inefficiencies that arise in the data transmission. As a result, the combined prior art is able to meet the limitations of the claims.

The examiner suggests distinctly pointing out how the transition is made from the power save mode to the normal mode, such as canceling the power-saving mode as decided by the communication control information as seen on Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0006-0007 as well as Page 19, Paragraph 0039 of the Specification. By incorporating those limitations into the claims, it would be able to overcome the prior art of record, but may require further searching and consideration.

AUNG S. MOE

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER